INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies shown them in the personal interview held on October 23, 2007. In attendance for the Applicants were Dr. Luis Serra, and Aaron Haleva, Esq., an attorney of record. Dr. Serra demonstrated an embodiment of the invention and Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed proposed claim amendments. The Examiner and Applicants' attorney discussed the cited Kockro reference, and agreement was reached that the independent claims would be amended as provided above which would distinguish over the Kockro reference.

REMARKS

This Amendment, in connection with the following remarks, are submitted as fully responsive to the Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 21, 22 24, 25, 26 and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 21, 22, and 25 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ralf A. Kockro et al., *Planning and Simulation of Neurosurgery in a Virtual Reality Environment*, Neurosurgey, Vol. 46, No. 1 (2000) ("Kockro").

Independent claim 1 describes a method of displaying 3D data. The method includes displaying at least one 3D data set defined by a 3D coordinate system, setting at least one boundary which divides said displayed at least one 3D data set into subregions, said subregions being bounded in said 3D coordinate system, assigning sets of display rules to each subregion, wherein said assigned sets of display rules are different from each other; and displaying said at least one 3D data set including said subregions according to said assigned sets of display rules.

- 10 -

The method further provides that the subregions are spatially separated by said at least one boundary and said at least one boundary is interactively modifiable on the display of the at least one 3D data set including said subregions by a user.

Independent claims 21, 22, and 25 recite similar features.

As described in the Specification, the claimed method can be used to compare, for example, two 3D data sets generated from diagnostic scans of a human. For example, a user could define two cubic subregions sharing a common planar boundary to compare co-registered CT and MRI 3D data sets obtained from scanning a human head. Specification at ¶¶44-55; Figs. 9-24 ("Example Implementation"). The user can, for example, move the common planar boundary to view the head first using MRI data and then using CT data. *Id.* Or, for example, a user can move the two subregions through the 3D co-ordinate system in which the two 3D data sets are defined, and thus see a side by side comparison of cubic regions of the head under CT and MRI. *Id.* This allows, for example, a neurosurgeon to have available a richer visualization of a patient's relevant anatomy.

As discussed in the personal interview, Kockro describes displaying various segmented objects such as tumors and nearby arteries, in different colors. Kockro does not teach or suggest setting at least one boundary which divides said displayed at least one 3D data set into subregions, said subregions being bounded in said 3D coordinate system, assigning sets of display rules to each subregion, wherein said assigned sets of display rules are different from each other; and displaying said at least one 3D data set including said subregions according to said assigned sets of display rules. Moreover, Kockro deals with pre-segmented objects, and does not describe a user interactively modifying the boundaries of a subregion so as, for example, to compare co-registered 3D data sets by moving the subregion boundaries, or by

- 11 -

moving the subregions through the 3D space. Thus, Kockro does not teach or suggest the claimed invnetion.

Claims 1-30, having been amended as agreed upon in the personal interview, are thus respectfully asserted as patentable over Kockro.

If any questions remain as to the patentability of the pending claims, Applicants respectfully request the opportunity to have a follow-up interview with the Examiner, review same, and present their point of view. The Examiner is thus invited to notify Applicants' undersigned attorney if such questions remain so that an interview can be scheduled.

No additional fees are believed due herewith. If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deemed necessary for the entry of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-0540.

Dated: **December 6, 2007**   Respectfully submitted,

Aaron S. Haleva, Reg. No. 44,733
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York   10036
(212) 715-7773 (telephone)
(212) 715-9397 (facsimile)

KL3 2629718.2